



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,802	02/06/2002	Alvin Wong	426882004000	2854

7590 05/24/2004

KATHERINE D. LEE
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

EXAMINER

STIMPAK, JOHNNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/071,802

Applicant(s)


WONG, ALVIN

Examiner

Johnna R Stimpak

Art Unit

3623



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a non-final office action upon examination of application number 10/071,802. Claims 1-31 are pending and have been examined on the merits discussed below.

Response to Amendment

2. Objections to the oath/declaration are withdrawn.
3. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., start point/end point pairs wherein customers provide information relating to order fulfillment at various points or stages along the order fulfillment process) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). As claimed, the start and end point pairs are representative of an event triggering a start of time period, etc. In light of this, the Martin et al reference measures delivery performance wherein it is determined if an item is delivered when requested. The customer enters an order and requests a delivery date; this requested delivery date is the start point. The date the order actually delivers is the end point. The performance calculation involves on-time product delivery statistics for each customer (different customers would have different start and end point pairs). The determination of whether the product delivery is on time is based upon the requested delivery date and the actual delivery date.
4. As for the argument that the reference does not teach reporting the performance for a supplier supplying items to more than one customer, it is well known that with the use of

Art Unit: 3623

spreadsheets, etc., one could display multiple data for multiple customers showing performance for each order placed. This is reflected in the rejections below.

5. In reference to claims 9-23, Applicant argues and requests prior art references to teach storing information such as supplier, buyer, and start point and end points, in a database to summarize purchase order information. Examiner would like to point out that these limitations are non-functional descriptive language and are given no patentable weight. As claimed, the supplier, buyer and start and end point data inputs do not affect the on-time delivery calculation. They are data inputs that are used to organize a report for convenient relay of information. There is no teaching of how the specific data inputs are manipulated to reach the on-time delivery calculation. It is old and well known to format a spreadsheet document with information such as the supplier, the buyer and the start/end point pairs to let one more accurately evaluate the on-time performance of shipments between customers and suppliers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. **Claims 1-8 and 24-31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Martin et al, US 5,960,408.

8. As per **claim 1**, Martin et al teaches storing purchase order data in a data base (column 2, lines 35-37); and generating on time performance reports from the purchase order data, the on

Art Unit: 3623

time performance reports including a number of orders delivered on time by a first supplier with respect to each of a plurality of start point / end point pairs, wherein the start point is representative of a plurality of events triggering a start of a time period used to measure delivery time, the end point is representative of a plurality of events triggering an end of a time period used to measure delivery time, and each of the plurality of start point/end point pairs can be different from each other for at least one buyer (column 4, lines 51-67 – Martin et al reference measures delivery performance wherein it is determined if an item is delivered when requested. The customer enters an order and requests a delivery date; this requested delivery date is the start point. The date the order actually delivers is the end point. The performance calculation involves on-time product delivery statistics for each customer (different customers would have different start and end point pairs). The determination of whether the product delivery is on time is based upon the requested delivery date and the actual delivery date).

As per **claim 2**, Martin et al teaches the on time performance reports also include a number of line items delivered on time by the first supplier with respect to each of the plurality of start point / end point pairs (column 5, lines 25-32 – chart shows the inclusion of line items for measuring the on time performance).

As per **claim 3**, Martin et al teaches the number of orders delivered on time is a percentage (column 5, lines 6-32 – shows the report format including percentage on-time).

As per **claim 4**, Martin et al teaches the number of orders delivered on time is a percentage and the number of line items delivered is a percentage (column 5, lines 6-32 – shows the report format includes percentage on-time for the number of units shipped and also in terms of line items).

Art Unit: 3623

As per **claim 5**, it is the system with executable code for performing the method of claim 1 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 1 also applies to claim 5.

As per **claim 6**, it is the system with executable code for performing the method of claim 2 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 2 also applies to claim 6.

As per **claim 7**, it is the system with executable code for performing the method of claim 3 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 3 also applies to claim 7.

As per **claim 8**, it is the system with executable code for performing the method of claim 4 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 4 also applies to claim 8.

As per **claim 24**, it is the system with means for performing the method of claim 1 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 1 also applies to claim 24.

As per **claim 25**, it is the system with means for performing the method of claim 2 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 2 also applies to claim 25.

As per **claim 26**, it is the system with means for performing the method of claim 3 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 3 also applies to claim 26.

As per **claim 27**, it is the system with means for performing the method of claim 4 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 4 also applies to claim 27.

As per **claim 28**, it is the computer program in an electronically readable medium with executable code for performing the method of claim 1 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 1 also applies to claim 28.

As per **claim 29**, it is the computer program in an electronically readable medium with executable code for performing the method of claim 2 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 2 also applies to claim 29.

Art Unit: 3623

As per **claim 30**, it is the computer program in an electronically readable medium with executable code for performing the method of claim 3 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 3 also applies to claim 30.

As per **claim 31**, it is the computer program in an electronically readable medium with executable code for performing the method of claim 4 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 4 also applies to claim 31.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 9-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al.

As per **claim 9**, Martin et al teaches summarizing the number of orders shipped and the number of orders on time and calculating the number of on time deliveries based on customer orders and delivery dates (column 5, lines 6-34) but does not explicitly teach, for a first and second subset of the plurality of records, storing in a database summarized purchase order data from a plurality of buyers, the summarized purchase order data comprising a plurality of records, each record in the plurality of records including a supplier, a buyer, a one of a plurality of start point / end point pairs for measuring on time delivery, a number of orders placed, and a number of orders delivered on time wherein each of the start point/end point pair can be different from each other for each of the plurality of buyers, the start point is representative of a plurality of events triggering a start of a time period used to measure delivery time, and the end point is

Art Unit: 3623

representative of a plurality of events triggering an end of a time period used to measure delivery time. Martin et al generates reports for each customer to convey the number of orders placed and the number of orders delivered on-time in terms of shipments or line items. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to generate a database with the summarized purchase order data for each customer containing the number of orders placed and number delivered on time, as well as, the supplier, the buyer, and the start/end point pairs used to measure the on time delivery to enable the user to more accurately evaluate the on-time performance of shipments between customers and suppliers.

As per **claim 10**, Martin et al does not explicitly teach for a third subset of the plurality of records, each record in the third subset including the first of the plurality of start point / end point pairs, the first supplier, and a first of the plurality of buyers, summing together the numbers of orders placed included in each record of the third subset to obtain a third total number of orders, the third total number of orders being a number of orders placed by the first buyer with the first supplier for which the first start point / end point pair is used to measure on time delivery; for the third subset of the plurality of records, summing together the number of orders delivered on time to obtain a number of the third total number of orders that were delivered on time; and reporting to the plurality of buyers the third total number of orders and the number of the third total number of orders that were delivered on time. Martin et al teaches summing together the number of orders placed to measure on time delivery and obtaining a number of the orders that were delivered on time for each customer (column 5, lines 1-34). Although Martin et al does not explicitly teach generating the total number of orders that were delivered on time for a third subset of the records, it would have been obvious to generate a database showing, for each order

Art Unit: 3623

placed between a customer and supplier, all the information to generate the on time performance to allow the user to more accurately evaluate the on time performance of shipments between several combinations of suppliers and customers.

As per **claim 11**, Martin et al teaches calculating, for each customer, the number of orders that were delivered on time and coming up with a percentage on-time comprising dividing the number of the first total number of orders that were delivered on time by the first total number of orders and multiplying the result by 100 (column 5, lines 1-34 – total units shipped / on-time units = percentage on time).

As per **claim 12**, Martin et al teaches calculating, for each customer, the number of orders that were delivered on time and coming up with a percentage on-time comprising dividing the number of the first total number of orders that were delivered on time by the first total number of orders and multiplying the result by 100 (column 5, lines 1-34 – total units shipped / on-time units = percentage on time).

As per **claim 13**, Martin et al teaches the third subset of the plurality of records consists of a single record (column 5, lines 1-5 - the method can be used for each customer which would correlate to a single record per customer).

As per **claim 14**, Martin et al does not explicitly teach for a third subset of the plurality of records, each record in the third subset including a first of the plurality of start point / end point pairs and a second supplier, summing together the number of orders placed included in each record of the third subset to obtain a third total number of orders, the third total being a total number of orders placed with the second supplier for which the first start point / end point pair is used to measure on time delivery; for the third subset of the plurality of records, summing

Art Unit: 3623

together the number of orders delivered on time included in each record of the third subset to obtain a number of the third total number of orders that were delivered on time; and reporting to the plurality of buyers and the plurality of suppliers the first total number of orders, the number of the first total number of orders that were delivered on time, the second total number of orders, the number of the second total number of orders that were delivered on time, the third total number of orders and the number of the third total number of orders that were delivered on time. Martin et al teaches summing together the number of orders placed to measure on time delivery and obtaining a number of the orders that were delivered on time for each customer (column 5, lines 1-34). Although Martin et al does not explicitly teach generating the total number of orders that were delivered on time for a first second or third subset of the records, it would have been obvious to generate a database showing, for each order placed between a customer and supplier, all the information to generate the on time performance to allow the user to more accurately evaluate the on time performance of shipments between several combinations of suppliers and customers.

As per **claim 15**, Martin et al teaches summing together the number of line items included in each record of the first subset to obtain a first total number of line items ordered from the first supplier for which the first start point / end point pair is used to measure on time delivery; summing together the number of line items delivered on time to obtain a number of the first total number of line items that were delivered on time; and reporting to the plurality of buyers the total number of line items and the number of the total number of line items that were delivered on time (column 5, lines 1-34 – the on time percentage is calculated for line items as well as shipments).

As per **claim 16**, Martin et al teaches dividing the number of the total number of orders that were delivered on time by the total number of orders and multiplying the result by 100 (column 5, lines 1-34 – total units shipped / on-time units = percentage on time – this is calculated for each customer who places orders).

As per **claim 17**, Martin et al teaches dividing the number of the total number of orders that were delivered on time and multiplying the result by 100; and dividing the number of the first total number of line items that were delivered on time by the first total number of line items and multiplying the result by 100 (column 5, lines 1-34 – total units shipped / on-time units = percentage on time – this is calculated for both shipments and line items for each customer who places orders).

As per **claim 18**, is the system with executable code for performing the method of claim 9 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 9 also applies to claim 18.

As per **claim 19**, is the system with executable code for performing the method of claim 10 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 10 also applies to claim 19.

As per **claim 20**, it is the system with executable code in an electronically readable medium for performing the method of claim 11 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 11 also applies to claim 20.

As per **claim 21**, it is the system with executable code in an electronically readable medium for performing the method of claim 12 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 12 also applies to claim 21.

Art Unit: 3623

As per **claim 22**, it is the system with executable code in an electronically readable medium for performing the method of claim 14 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 14 also applies to claim 22.

As per **claim 23**, it is the system with executable code in an electronically readable medium for performing the method of claim 15 therefore the same rejection as applied to claim 15 also applies to claim 23.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnna R Stimpak whose telephone number is 703-305-4566. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 703-305-9643. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Js
May 18, 2004


TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600